

**STATE BOARD ADVISORY PANEL
FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION**

The Arizona State Advisory Panel for Special Education held a meeting at Balsz School District, Board Room, 4825 E. Roosevelt, Phoenix, Arizona, from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Members Present

J'Anne Affeld
Johanna Bookbinder
M. Diane Bruening
Susan Douglas, Co-chair
Molly Dries
Jason Geroux
Phyllis Green
Robert Hill
Kathy McDonald
Megan McGlynn
Mattie McVey Lord
Terisa Rademacher, Co-chair
Jean Sargent Richards, Ed.D
Kay B. Turner, Ed.D, Vice-chairperson
Nancy Williams

Others Present

Joanne Phillips, ADE/ESS
Lynn Busenbark, ADE/ESS
Jeannette Zemeida, ADE/ESS

Members Absent

Ronald L. Clanton
Rebecca Hall
Erik Jensen
Kim Simmons

Minutes Approved (As Read)(As Amended)

Chairperson: _____

Signature

Date

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
1. Call to order.	Sue Douglas, Co-Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m.	1. None
2. Approval of June 20, 2006 minutes.	Megan McGlynn made a motion and seconded by Phyllis Green to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2006 meeting.	2. Motion carried
3. Public comment.	Terisa Rademacher welcomed the public in attendance. She explained to those present the procedures for making a comment. Anyone wishing to comment on an agenda item was asked to fill out a brief questionnaire stating which agenda item they wished to comment on. That person would then be called on when that item was discussed.	3. None
4. Panel Introductions.	Attending SEAP members introduced themselves, informed everyone which category they were representing and gave a brief description of why they became members.	4. None
5. Exceptional Student Services.	<p>Miriam Podrazik, the Director of Comprehensive System for Personnel Development (CSPD) updated the Panel on current State Improvement Grant (SIG) activities.</p> <p>The SIG is a federal grant that states need to apply for. Arizona is on the 5th year of the grant. Ms. Podrazik explained that the purpose of her presentation was to share the results of the three goals over the last four years and to get input from the Panel regarding the next SIG grant. The grant deadline is Spring 2007.</p> <p>Ms. Podrazik outlined the purpose of the SIG as well as the partners the state of Arizona is required to work with. Systemic change is the key to the grant. Grant recipients need to show good intent on how the changes will be sustained throughout the grant period and beyond. The three goals were: Qualified Personnel, Compliant and Quality Charter Schools, and Research-Based Literacy/Reading.</p> <p>Ms. Podrazik outlined some of the highlights of accomplishments which include:</p> <p>Goal 1: To reduce teacher turnover and increase teachers with fully certified credentials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 105 districts and charter schools were using the AEEB (Arizona Education Employment Board) Online application as of June 2004. • On-line application use by Districts increased 200%. • Partnerships have been developed with Teach for America by several school districts to help increase the number of highly qualified diverse teachers. • SELECT on-line courses have assisted special education teachers to complete their coursework for cross-categorical certification. <p>Goal 2: To improve programmatic compliance and program effectiveness on charter schools.</p>	5. None

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Charter application has been revised and approved by the State Charter Board.• Prospective charter applicants and ADE application reviewers now receive training on the new requirements.• Legal requirements training is provided for new charter owners and operators.	
	<p>Goal 3: To improve early literacy and reading skills for children and youth with disabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Arizona Literacy and Learning Center (ALLC) have provided Part 1 and Part 2 literacy training for early education staff in developing and increasing family involvement in effective literacy activities.• The ALLC has trained early education staff in the administration of Get Ready to Read pre and post screening tool.• An Early Childhood Certificate was approved by the State Board of Education that included coursework in assessment, linguistic awareness, and emergent writing skills.	
	<p>The next step for our SIG is to align with federal performance indicators. Arizona's primary goals will be to increase the number of highly qualified teachers and increase reading literacy.</p>	
	<p>The Panel discussed the SIG 2 proposed goal areas and brainstormed ideas for Ms. Podrazik to include in the grant application.</p>	
	<p>Joanne Phillips, Deputy Associate Superintendent, ESS reported on the OSEP Leadership Conference. The purpose of the conference this year was to solicit questions about the new regulations for IDEA 04. A PowerPoint was shown that gave the same technical assistance that has been on the OSEP website for a year. Participants were allowed to fill out cards asking questions regarding the regulations during the conference. On the last day, they responded to some of the questions. However, the ones OSEP responded to were the ones that were black and white in the regulations. Ms. Phillips were disappointed overall with the conference.</p>	
	<p>Robert Hill also attended the Leadership Conference and commented on his experience at the conference.</p>	
	<p>The regulations for IDEA 04 have finally been distributed. The entire document is 1,700 pages. About 70% of the document is the comments made regarding the regulations. The new regulations cover about 300 pages. Implementation training for the regulations is scheduled for February 2007.</p>	
	<p>Ms. Phillips explained a few of the changes made in the regs.</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>Ms. Phillips announced that Art Cernosia would be presenting at the Director's Conference on October 30. He was scheduled to go through the new regs.</p> <p>froma Cummings, the Director of Assistive Technology is also responsible for Textbook Accessibility Act which is tied to NIMAC (National Instructional Material Access Center) and NIMAS (National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard). By December all districts need to opt in or out of NIMAC. Each district needs to sign an assurance to that affect.</p> <p>Arizona is an early adoption state. This means Arizona has had a statute on the books for two year. Unfortunately the rules are not written yet. The statute ensures that any textbook that is purchased from a publisher must be guaranteed to be available in a universal format (CD, etc). The rules need to be finalized by December 31, 2006. They will need to be compliant with IDEA 04.</p> <p>Assistive Technology held a training in September that was well received by attendees. The training was the first of five trainings scheduled. The focus of the trainings is to assist schools in how to use assistive technology throughout a curriculum. Each training has a different topic.</p> <p>The Assistive Technology Loan Library is ready to go. An agreement has been signed with vendors which will allow the state to borrow equipment from them at minimal or no cost. This allows us to update the equipment as it becomes available so that when a district borrows equipment it is getting the latest version. The district can then train the student on the latest equipment and make informed decisions on which equipment to purchase.</p>	
6. Response to Intervention (RTI)	<p>Dolores Ratcliff, Program Specialist, ADE/ESS educated the Panel on Response to Intervention (RTI).</p> <p>RTI currently only covers grades K-8. A task force of about 50 people is considering a secondary model.</p> <p>IDEA '04 allows districts to identify students with learning disabilities using a response to intervention process as part of the evaluation. The state is training district teams in how to use the RTI process in order to keep continuity between districts.</p> <p>RTI starts in general education. The components of Arizona's K-8 RTI process include: three-tiered model; screening and benchmarking of the whole school with curriculum-based measures (CBM) at least 3 times a year; data decision points for whole grade and individual interventions; team process of studying those children who fall below a certain criteria in performance; and scientifically-based interventions with at-risk students using progress monitoring.</p>	6. None.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>Ms. Ratcliff explained the three-tiered RTI model. The first tier includes: standards and scientifically-based whole class instruction; screening of all children in reading, math, and writing, and small group instruction involving little remediation. This is for 100% of the students. The second tier may include: small group remediation; Title programs (EL/reading); before and after school programs; peer tutoring/coaching; volunteer services; and computer-based systems. Ten to twenty-five percent of students are in this tier because of lack of response to general instruction. The third tier includes: students in the monitored intervention stage and special education students. Three to five percent of students are in this tier because of lack of progress in tier two.</p> <p>Ms. Ratcliff reviewed the steps in the RTI process which included screening all students and reviewing the test data to determine if some whole classes need interventions. The purpose of whole class intervention is to improve instruction at the first level so that most students can stay in tier one.</p> <p>Part of Tier 2 includes: "Can't Do or Won't Do". The student is given reinforcements if they can beat their prior score. This is given before the child enters Tier Two and gives a teacher a better idea of which students have a skill problem and need to move to Tier 2 intervention. Tier 3 is for those students who are still not progressing in Tier 2. Tier 3 is more intensive supports. Students still resistive to intervention may go on to referral for special education.</p> <p>Some districts have their teachers do the testing and some districts bring in outside individuals to do the testing. A booklet and a CD have been developed that schools can distribute to parents so that they can understand RTI.</p> <p>Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) is a method of monitoring the educational progress of students through the direct assessment of academic skills. It is used for screening and benchmarking and to measure individual response. Ms. Ratcliff showed several math problems as samples of how math is scored.</p> <p>ADE is training districts in Arizona the components of RTI. The training is supported by coaches and all the materials are provided. ADE has also created a taskforce to help design the process and has created an RTI website with resources.</p> <p>Eighteen districts participated in the Pilot for K-8 RTI, Year One. Pilot teams must have an administrator, psychologist, special education teacher, and a general education teacher. The pilot teams come from all over the state and are traditional districts and charters. Thirty teams are participating this year.</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>Sue Douglas's school is participating in the pilot project and she spoke about her school's positive experience in using RTI.</p> <p>What does the data tell the district?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally reading and math achievement levels increased with the process.• Referrals for special education appear to be down because needs are being met in general classrooms.• Generally those students completing interventions in tiers two and three progressed markedly <p>The ADE website for more information on RTI is: www.ade.az.gov//ESS/rti.</p> <p>Ms. Ratcliff fielded questions from the Panel.</p>	
7. State Performance Plan Indicators.	<p>Dr. Lynn Busenbark, Director of Program Support/ESS (Exceptional Student Services), updated the Panel on the latest work being done by ESS with regard to monitoring and disproportionality.</p> <p>Dr. Busenbark explained the federal definition of disproportionality when monitoring special education. It is possible that a district could have disproportionate representation of a racial/ethnic group but that disproportionality is the basic nature of their district population. For some monitored districts it is difficult to decide if the disproportionality is a result of over identification or due to district population.</p> <p>The consequences to a school for being out compliance is that the State has to, by statute, direct them to take 15 percent of their IDEA funds and put it towards early intervening services.</p> <p>Dr. Busenbark gave the Panel a chart of 13 unidentified school districts and asked them to help determine whether or not the school/district was out of compliance regarding disproportionality. The chart included the areas of disproportionality and the non-compliant items in the 2006 monitoring.</p> <p>The Panel broke into small groups to review the chart and then regrouped to share their conclusions. After a lengthy discussion the Panel determined that they could not charge any district as being out of compliance based on the data they were given. They recommended that ESS give each questionable district the option to do a drill-down in each disproportionality category. Dr. Busenbark will bring the results of the drill-downs to the November SEAP meeting.</p>	7. Motion carried.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	<p>Robert Hill made a motion to allow districts to provide drill-down information to SEAP. After further discussion Robert Hill amended his motion to read: We recommend to ADE to request that districts provide drill-down information on the areas of disproportionality and that ADE bring the information, in a confidential format, to SEAP at the November meeting so SEAP can provide further recommendations. It was seconded by Jean Sargent Richards. Eleven members approved the motion. Diane Bruening abstained.</p> <p>Valerie Andrews, Program Manager, Early Childhood Special Education, reported on "In by 3" data. There are currently three different ways to collect data: 1) SAIS, 2) Monitoring, and 3) Self-reporting. There is a 20% discrepancy between the 3 reporting systems.</p> <p>There are a few problems with each collection process. SAIS system is not fully built to accommodate preschool data. SAIS does not have the data that lets a district know whether or not a child that transfers from AZEIP by his 3rd birthday qualifies for special education services. Monitoring only takes a small sample and currently it is not matching SAIS data. ADE provides districts with a sample data base that they can use for self-reporting. If they use the data base throughout the school year the data would be fairly accurate. However, not every district uses the data base and then has to scramble to assemble the data.</p> <p>Ms. Andrews reviewed the various categories of children that need to be reported in "In by 3" data. Ms. Andrews fielded questions from the Panel.</p> <p>The Panel suggested that ADE use the end of year report by districts.</p>	
8. Panel Business	<p>The vice chairperson position was opened for election. Ms. Douglas reviewed the duties of the vice chairperson. Ms. Douglas opened the floor for nominations of the vice chairperson. This is a one-year position. Diane Bruening nominated Kay Turner for the position. Phyllis Green seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations. Dr. Turner was re-elected for the position of co-chair.</p> <p>Ms. Douglas asked for volunteers to attend the September State Board meeting when Joanne Phillips presented the Annual Report to the State Board. Robert Hill volunteered and it was determined that the Executive Committee would ask Megan McGlynn to attend as well.</p> <p>Discussion of School Facilities Board presentation tabled due to lack of time. Ms. Rademacher encouraged Panel members to reread the minutes from the June 20 meeting and come prepared to discuss them at the November meeting.</p>	8. Motion carried.
9. Adjournment	The next SEAP meeting is scheduled for November 28, 2006.	9. Adjournment.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
	Ms. Rademacher adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.	